## **EXHIBIT 4**

## REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

Page 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 17-cv-00939-WHA

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; OTTOMOTTO, LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,

Defendants.

VIDEO DEPOSITION OF EMIL MICHAEL

San Francisco, California

Friday, July 28, 2017

Volume I

REPORTED BY:

REBECCA L. ROMANO, RPR, CSR No. 12546

JOB NO. 2666869

PAGES 1 - 160

		Page 138
1	efforts in the long run concerning autonomous	02:24:09
2	vehicles?	
3	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
4	THE DEPONENT: I don't know exactly if it	
5	was going to save us money. It was more about	02:24:21
6	time.	
7	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) When Uber was	
8	considering acquiring Otto, did Uber come up with	
9	an internal valuation of Otto?	
10	A. I don't recall that we did.	02:24:37
11	Q. Describe the state of Uber's autonomous	
12	vehicle technology when you left Uber.	
13	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
14	THE DEPONENT: I just I am not a	
15	technologist, so I don't know. I just know that	02:25:05
16		
	but that's	
20	sort of much as all I had knowledge about.	02:25:32
21	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) Do you know whether	
22	how far away Uber was for from a commercial	
23	launch when you left Uber?	
24	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
25	THE DEPONENT:	02:25:45

		Page 139
1		
9	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
10	THE DEPONENT: No idea.	02:26:24
11	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) When when you left	
12	Uber, did you have any idea of how many LiDAR units	
13	Uber was planning to manufacture this year?	
14	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
15	THE DEPONENT: No.	02:26:43
16	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) Does Waymo have a	
17	technological lead with respect to autonomous	
18	vehicle development?	
19	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
20	THE DEPONENT: Yes, it is my belief.	02:26:58
21	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) Has acquiring Otto	
22	changed Uber's estimate of Waymo's lead?	
23	MS. RAY: Objection. Form.	
24	THE DEPONENT: Not as far as I know.	
25	Q. (By Mr. Perlson) Do you agree that the	02:27:16

I, Rebecca L. Romano, a Certified Shorthand 1 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby 2 3 certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken 4 before me at the time and place herein set forth; 5 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, 6 prior to testifying, were administered an oath; 7 that a record of the proceedings was made by me 8 using machine shorthand which was thereafter 9 transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing 10 transcript is true record of the testimony given. 11 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the 12 original transcript of a deposition in a Federal 13 Case, before completion of the proceedings, review 14 of the transcript [ ] was [X] was not requested. 15 I further certify I am neither financially 16 interested in the action nor a relative or employee 17 of any attorney or any party to this action. 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date 19 subscribed my name. 20 21 Dated: July 29, 2017 2.2 23 24 Rebecca L. Romano, RPR, CSR. No 12546 25

Page 160